



JPW

Docket No.: 1594.1242

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of:

Heui Seag PARK

Serial No. 10/691,595

Group Art Unit: 3742

Confirmation No. 7299

Filed: October 24, 2003

Examiner: Van, Quang T.

For: TRANSFORMER ASSEMBLY FOR MICROWAVE OVEN, METHOD FOR
MANUFACTURING THE SAME, AND MICROWAVE OVEN HAVING THE SAME

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is responsive to the Office Action mailed September 20, 2004, having a shortened period for response set to expire on October 20, 2004, the following remarks are provided.

I. Provisional Election of Claims Pursuant to 37 CFR §1.142

Applicants provisionally elect Group I, claims 1-36, in response to the preliminary restriction requirement set forth in the Office Action.

II. Applicants Traverse the Requirement

Insofar as Group II is concerned, it is believed that claims 37-61 are so closely related to elected claims 1-36 that they should remain in the same application. The elected claims 1-36 are directed to a transformer assembly for a microwave oven and a microwave oven and claims 37-61 are drawn to methods for manufacturing a transformer assembly for a microwave oven. There have been no references cited to show any necessity for requiring restriction and, in fact, it is believed that the Examiner would find references containing both apparatus and method claims in the same field of technology. While it is noted that the Examiner has identified different classifications for the apparatus and method claims, it is believed that classification is not conclusive on the question of restriction. It is believed, moreover, that evaluation of both sets of claims would not provide an undue burden upon the Examiner at this time in comparison with the additional expense and delay to Applicants in having to protect the additional subject matter

recited by the Group * claims by filing a divisional application.

MPEP §803 sets forth the criteria for restriction between patentably distinct inventions. (A) indicates that the inventions must be independent (see MPEP §802.01, §806.04, §808.01) or distinct as claimed (see MPEP §806.05-806.05(i)); and (B) indicates that there must be a serious burden on the Examiner if restriction is required (see MPEP §803.02, §806.04(a)- §806.04(i), §808.01(a) and §808.02). The Examiner has not set forth why there would be a serious burden if restriction is required.

III. Conclusion

Upon review of references involved in this field of technology, when considering that the methods recited by the Group 37-61 claims are directed to methods for manufacturing a transformer assembly for a microwave oven, and elected claims 1-36 are directed to a transformer assembly for a microwave oven and a microwave oven, and when all of the other various facts are taken into consideration, it is believed that upon reconsideration of the Examiner's initial restriction requirement, all of the pending claims should be examined in the subject application.

In view of the foregoing amendments, arguments and remarks, all claims are deemed to be allowable and this application is believed to be in condition for allowance.

If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our deposit account number 19-3935.

Should any questions remain unresolved, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicants' attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: October 18, 2004

By: _____



Howard I. Levy
Registration No. 55,378

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Ste. 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 434-1500